1 2 3 4	Ramon Rossi Lopez (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) (CA Bar No. 86361) LOPEZ McHUGH LLP 100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600 Newport Beach, California 92660 rlopez@lopezmchugh.com	
4   5   6   7   8   9   10   11   12   13   14   15   16	Mark S. O'Connor (011029) GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A. 2575 East Camelback Road Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225 Telephone: (602) 530-8000 mark.oconnor@gknet.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs  Richard B. North, Jr. (admitted pro hac vice) Georgia Bar No. 545599 Matthew B. Lerner (admitted pro hac vice) Georgia Bar No. 446986 NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP 201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700 Atlanta, GA 30363 Telephone: (404) 322-6000 Telephone: (602) 382-6000 Telephone: (602) 382-6000 Tichard.north@nelsonmullins.com matthew.lerner@nelsonmullins.com	d
17	Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.	
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
19	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
20	In Re Bard IVC Filters Products Liability Litigation	No. MD-15-02641-PHX-DGC
21 22 23	DORIS SINGLETON JONES, an individual,  Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED ADDITIONAL VOIR DIRE QUESTIONS AND DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS
24 25 26 27	v.  C.R. BARD, INC., a New Jersey corporation and BARD PERIPHERAL VASCULAR, an Arizona corporation,  Defendants.	(The Honorable David G. Campbell)
28		

1 Plaintiff Doris Jones submits the following proposed additional voir dire questions 2 as directed in the Court's Order dated March 30, 2018 [Doc. 10587]. PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED VOIR DIRE QUESTIONS IN ADDITION TO 3 **BOOKER VOIR DIRE** 4 1. Is there anyone on the panel who would have a difficult time awarding 5 punitive damages in a personal injury lawsuit regardless of my instructions or the 6 7 evidence? 2. Does anyone on the panel believe that punitive damages should not be 8 allowed in personal injury cases? 9 10 THE DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS: 11 The Defendants object to these additional questions on the grounds that they imply 12 that Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages. Defendants further object on the 13 grounds that they are confusing, and as the Court indicated in its ruling on the jury 14 questionnaire the prospect jurors are likely not to understand what is being asked. 15 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of May, 2018. 16 17 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A. 18 By: /s/ Mark S. O'Connor By: /s/ Kate Helm on behalf of 19 Mark S. O'Connor (011029) James R. Condo (005867) 2575 East Camelback Road Amanda C. Sheridan (027360) 20 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225 One Arizona Center 400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900 21 Ramon Rossi Lopez Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202 (admitted *pro hac vice*) CA Bar No. 86361 22 Richard B. North, Jr. (pro hac vice) LOPEZ McHUGH LLP Georgia Bar No. 545599 23 100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600 Matthew B. Lerner (pro hac vice) Newport Beach, California 92660 Georgia Bar No. 446986 24 Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough Attorneys for Plaintiffs LLP 25 201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700 Atlanta, GA 30363 26 Attorneys for C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. 27 28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I hereby certify that on this 1st day of May, 2018, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing. /s/ Gay Mennuti